

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 376

August 9, 1995, 3:49 p.m.  
Page S-12019 Temp. Record

## INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS/Red Wolf Reintroduction

**SUBJECT:** Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1977.  
Reid motion to table the Helms modified amendment No. 2309.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 50-48

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$12.053 billion in new budget authority, which is \$69 million more than the House-passed bill provided, \$1.76 billion less than the Administration requested, and 11 percent less than the fiscal year (FY) 1995 level.

**The Helms modified amendment** would bar using funds appropriated under this Act to implement and carry out the Red Wolf reintroduction program.

During debate, Senator Reid moved to table the Helms amendment. The motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

The Red Wolf Program principally affects North Carolina. Most of us know very little about this program, and we are initially inclined to defer to the judgment of the Senators from North Carolina. However, we must oppose this amendment for two reasons. First, it is clearly legislative in nature, and therefore does not belong on an appropriations bill. This issue should be brought up on an authorization bill. Second, the issue is not simply an issue for North Carolina because the wolves we are talking about have been released on Federal lands. Most Americans are strongly in favor of protecting endangered species. The red wolf is so endangered that it was declared extinct in the wild 15 years ago. In 1987, the Federal Government sought to reverse that extinction by beginning a reintroduction program. Those wolves were not reintroduced in land owned by North Carolina--they were reintroduced on Federal lands and on some privately owned lands that were volunteered for the purpose. Our understanding is that if those wolves leave

(See other side)

YEAS (50)			NAYS (48)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (7 or 13%)	Democrats (43 or 96%)		Republicans (46 or 87%)	Democrats (2 or 4%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Chafee	Akaka	Johnston	Abraham	Helms	Byrd	Mack <sup>-2</sup>	Bradley <sup>-4</sup>
Cohen	Baucus	Kennedy	Ashcroft	Hutchison	Conrad		
Gregg	Biden	Kerrey	Bennett	Inhofe			
Jeffords	Bingaman	Kerry	Bond	Kassebaum			
Roth	Boxer	Kohl	Brown	Kempthorne			
Snowe	Breaux	Lautenberg	Burns	Kyl			
Specter	Bryan	Leahy	Campbell	Lott			
	Bumpers	Levin	Coats	Lugar			
	Daschle	Lieberman	Cochran	McCain			
	Dodd	Mikulski	Coverdell	McConnell			
	Dorgan	Moseley-Braun	Craig	Murkowski			
	Exon	Moynihan	D'Amato	Nickles			
	Feingold	Murray	DeWine	Packwood			
	Feinstein	Nunn	Dole	Pressler			
	Ford	Pell	Domenici	Santorum			
	Glenn	Pryor	Faircloth	Shelby			
	Graham	Reid	Frist	Simpson			
	Harkin	Robb	Gorton	Smith			
	Heflin	Rockefeller	Gramm	Stevens			
	Hollings	Sarbanes	Grams	Thomas			
	Inouye	Simon	Grassley	Thompson			
		Wellstone	Hatch	Thurmond			
			Hatfield	Warner			

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Federal lands private property owners may kill them. The Fish and Wildlife Service has classified these wolves as "nonessential" meaning that they are not protected when they are not on Federal lands. Even if these wolves were being released only on private property this issue would not be just an issue for South Carolina. Americans favor protecting endangered species. They want a diversity of flora and fauna. If we make this exception for the Senator from North Carolina, then another Senator may demand an exception for his or her State, and then other Senators will demand exceptions, until we will have pretty much made piecework of the Endangered Species Act. Red wolves have undeniably caused a few problems in North Carolina, but we think, with all due respect, that our colleagues have exaggerated those problems. The reintroduction program is working well and should continue. We therefore favor the motion to table the Helms amendment.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

The Red Wolf Program began in 1987 when the Fish and Wildlife Service released 63 red wolves in eastern North Carolina on Federal lands. Those wolves have multiplied--there are now an estimated 170 in eastern North Carolina. The Fish and Wildlife Service has now placed some wolves in Tennessee and South Carolina as well. Each year the Federal Government spends \$1 million on the Red Wolf Program. These wolves have not stayed put on Federal lands. They slink onto private property, they attack and feed upon farm animals and livestock, and we have reports that at least one child has been bitten. Until this April, North Carolinians faced massive fines if they dared to do anything about these dangerous predators. Finally, after extensive pressure, the Fish and Wildlife Service finally agreed to let property owners shoot wolves that come on their property. We applaud this rare display of reason. We add that these wolves are doing a fine job of breeding without spending \$1 million a year to follow them around. We are not calling for the eradication of red wolves from North Carolina, but we are against wasting any more money on this program. Private property owners should have full authority to keep dangerous predatory animals off of their property without being threatened by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government should quit wasting money trying to expand the number of red wolves in North Carolina. The Helms amendment would put a stop to the Red Wolf Program, and thus merits our strong support.